

Year One Report

- HB 328 from the 2009 Legislature appropriated \$300,000 for a Performance-based Compensation Pilot Program. Funds are allocated for a limited number of school-developed and implemented programs to recognize and reinforce quality performance.
- Five Schools were selected to participate in the Performance-based Compensation Pilot Program:
 - Ashman Elementary Sevier District
 - Canyon Rim Academy charter
 - Manila Elementary Alpine District
 - Midway Elementary Wasatch District
 - Wasatch Peak Academy charter
- Assistance from Utah State Office of Education
 - Site visits by Superintendent Shumway and Deputy Superintendent Menlove
 - Assistance to school principals and staff – multiple meetings and site visits
 - Sydney Dickson, John Jesse, Andrea Rorrer
- School plans were developed in each school and contain three (3) essential components
 - Quality Instruction ~ 40% of compensation
 - Student Learning Outcomes – 40% of compensation
 - Community Satisfaction – 20% of compensation
- A rubric against which all the plans were critiqued was developed and all plans were evaluated against the rubric (Plan Checklist attached). As needed, plans were revised and following additional assistance from USOE staff, all five plans were eventually approved.
- Teacher Compensation
 - Each teacher who participated in the development of the plans during the 2009-2010 school year received \$2,000 (\$1,000 in December 2009 and \$1,000 in June 2010).
 - \$2,000 per participating teacher is available for the 2010-2011 school year and will be distributed based on the individual school plan. Each plan is different but distribution may be based on:
 - Individual teacher and classroom performance
 - Grade level or learning community performance
 - School-wide performance
- All plans are designed to allow for differentiated distribution of the funds based on the school's plan and various evaluation and criteria developed and agreed upon by each school.
- 2010-2011 Activities
 - Additional professional development and monitoring as needed.
 - Final evaluation and report following the implementation of the plan and the distribution of each school's allocation at the end of the 2010-2011 school year.

Performance Based Compensation Pilots

Plan Checklist

	Yes	No
1. Overview	—	—
One-page general description of your plan.		
2. Descriptor of Process	—	—
No more than a one-page description of the process you have experienced in developing your plan.		
3. Assessment of Quality Instruction		
a. Tools or Instrument(s)	—	—
Is quality of instruction measured appropriately and effectively?		
b. Standard(s) to Measure	—	—
Is there an achievable standard against which all teachers will be measured?		
c. Guarantee of Differentiation	—	—
Are individual and group differences accounted for?		
4. Assessment of Student Performance		
a. Tools of Instrument(s)	—	—
Is student performance measured appropriately and effectively?		
b. Standard(s) to Measure	—	—
Is there a student performance standard against which all teachers will be measured?		
c. Guarantee of Differentiation	—	—
Are individual and group differences accounted for?		
5. Assessment of Satisfaction		
a. Tools or Instrument(s)	—	—
Is stake holder satisfaction measured appropriately and effectively?		
b. Standard(s) to Measure	—	—
Is there a satisfaction standard against which all teachers will be measured?		
c. Guarantee of Differentiation	—	—
Are individual and group differences accounted for?		
6. Allocation of Performance-Based Pay		
a. Justification for Distribution	—	—
Describe the justification for how the \$2,000 per teacher will be allocated at the end of the implementation year (year 2).		
b. Summary Sheet/Score Sheet	—	—
Is there evidence of how (1) quality instruction, (2) student performance, and (3) satisfaction will be applied as the performance-based compensation is given?		
i. 40% Quality Instruction	—	—
Is 40% of compensation based on quality instruction?		
ii. 40% Student Performance	—	—
Is 40% of compensation based on student performance?		
iii. 20% Satisfaction	—	—
Is 20% of compensation based on stake holder satisfaction?		

Ashman Elementary

OVERVIEW

Our Performance Compensation Plan will be conducted as follows:

1. We will gather student achievement data on the number of children in our school who achieve their individual growth targets in literacy on the NWEA Primary Map and MAP assessment during the 2010-2011 school year. We will use the student achievement data from the three benchmarking assessments developed by The North West Evaluation Association and administered in the Primary MAP test for kindergarten and first grade students and on the MAP assessment for 2nd grade students. This achievement data at the school, grade, and individual classroom level will be worth a total of 40% of the compensation.

2. We will gather observation data collected from teachers, students, peers, and supervisors regarding classroom instructional activities. We will use the electronic, web-based iObservation rubric that encompasses 41 instructional strategies from which teachers can choose from to develop their own unique professional development plan. We'll use walk-throughs, teacher rounds, teachers' self-observation and self-reflection to enable teachers to develop their own unique instructional profile--to get a kind of "sense of themselves." The results of these observations will be worth a total of 40% of the compensation.

3. We will gather parent satisfaction surveys twice during the year (Fall & Spring) via an electronic survey developed by teachers and parents and assisted by Andrea Rorer at the Utah Educational Policy Center at the University of Utah. The satisfaction data gleaned from these surveys will be worth a total of 20% of the compensation.

Based on the data collected as outlined in numbers 1 and 2 and 3 above, teachers will set personal learning goals for enhancing their own personal instructional expertise in the engagement and achievement of students. Teachers will engage in deliberate practice aimed at improving their skills as chosen and outlined in their personal learning plan.

We know our school is only as good as our least effective teacher. We know, without a doubt, that we have a short three-year window of opportunity with these youngest of children wherein our work together can make or break a child's entire future academic experience. Research done in Tennessee has shown value-added statistical information that indicates the negative impact of low-performing teachers is severe, ***particularly during the earlier years of schooling***. At the primary level, students placed with low-performing teachers for several years in a row suffer an educational loss, which is largely irreversible. In fact, we may even be establishing a foundation, rather, a path that leads a child to an intellectual future that either limits or liberates his or her ultimate human potential.

THIS is the true measure of accountability to which we Ashman educators owe our students, their families, their community, their country and their Creator. This is the level of accountability to which we pledge ourselves and into which we realize any man-made assessment can merely provide a glimpse.

Canyon Rim Academy Performance Pay Pilot Plan

PURPOSE: *Create a forum to discuss education; create a student-centered culture of improvement; Emphasize the professional role of teachers; support teacher improvement.*

Canyon Rim Academy will use **UTAH CORE MATH STANDARDS** as the content focus for school improvement and the performance pay pilot plan in 2010-2011.

Canyon Rim has 21 k-6 classroom teachers and 1 Special Education teacher participating in the Performance Pay Pilot Plan.

Quality Instruction	= 40% =	\$17,600.00
Student Achievement	= 40% =	\$17,600.00
Community Satisfaction	= 20% =	<u>\$ 8,800.00</u>
22 teachers @ \$2,000.00 per teacher	=	\$44,000.00

Quality Instruction

Measure 1 - Assessing and Evaluating Student Learning-Utah Professional Teacher Standard (UPTS) #4 = 50% of \$17,600.00 or \$8,800.

Each teacher will focus on and set goals to accomplish **proficient or master** level in each of the five objectives for standard 4 – assessing and evaluating student learning. The expectation is that every teacher will advance to proficient or master level in assessing and evaluating student learning by setting specific goals with a teacher driven support plan and lines of evidence to demonstrate proficient or master level for UPTS #4.

\$8,800.00 divided by 5 objectives = \$1,760.00 per objective

\$1,760.00 divided by 22 teachers = \$80.00 will be awarded to each teacher, for each of the five objectives, who advances from emerging to proficient; proficient to master; or continues at master level.

Funds not awarded will be divided equally between teachers at the master level for each objective.

Measure 2 - UPTS 1-3 = 50% of 17,600.00 or \$8,800

Each teacher will review UPTS 1-3 during a meeting with an administrator to choose a focus and set **2-3 specific goals** for proficient or master level. The UPTS goal setting will be individualized and standards based for each teacher depending on their experience, performance level and focus for improvement. The process is set-up to be intrinsically motivating, teacher driven, supported, and requires lines of evidence to demonstrate growth and performance level accomplishment.

\$8,800.00 will be divided equally by the number of teachers who accomplish their proficient or master level goals for UPTS 1-3.

Proficient or master in UPTS #5, demonstrating professionalism to support student learning, is expected for employment of all Canyon Rim teachers and is not a focused part of the school improvement plan.

Student Achievement

The Utah Core Math Standards are the performance standards against which growth will be measured. Individual student performance goals will be differentiated in alignment with the benchmark testing, formative and summative testing, student disabilities, and student needs.

Tools for Assessing Student Performance Goals include benchmark assessments for each grade level aligned with Utah Core Math Standards; formative and summative assessments aligned with Utah Core Math Standards; Excelsior Pinnacle Gradebook; CRA 4-1 Learning scale.

The performance pay for student achievement will be awarded for reaching the student performance/growth goals for each *Utah Core Math Standard*.

\$17,600 divided by 22 teachers = \$800.00 per teacher; \$800.00 divided by the # of standards for each grade level:

K–2nd Grade = 3 Utah Math Core Standards for each grade level = \$267.00 for each standard

4th– 6th Grade = 5 Utah Math Core Standards for each grade level = \$160.00 for each standard

Funds not awarded will be divided equally between all teachers reaching their student performance goals for each Utah State Core Math Standard.

Community Satisfaction will be measured against the questions in the Satisfaction Survey created by Veamos Survey Solutions (VSS). VSS consulted with two focus groups of Canyon Rim Academy teachers, parents and administration in creating the survey.

\$8,800.00 will be divided equally between all teachers reaching 80% of their total responses “meets all expectations” or “exceeds expectations.”

The Canyon Rim Performance Pay Pilot Plan is standards based and created to support a student centered culture of teacher improvement.

Manila Elementary School Performance Based Pay Overview

100% Compensation = 2000 Points
Every measure is Standards Based

Points	Measures	Team or Individual	When Assessed	Who Assesses
Student Learning Goals = 40% (800 points)				
300	Standardized Assessments – Progress Scores CRT Progress Scores in Math and Language Arts for grades 2-6. Utah Kindergarten Assessment and a Alpine District Developed Math and Language Arts Assessments for Grade 1. The K and grade 1 assessments have been scaled to fit into the progress chart.	Team Points	Spring Assessment with progress measuring Spring of previous year with Spring of compensation year.	-Teachers administer the assessments to students. -Points earned for compensation based on predetermined table. -Details in the body of this report.
300	Direct Reading Assessment (DRA) – Progress Scores All students grades K-6. A progress chart has been developed to show progress points similar to the CRT progress chart.	Individual Points	Spring Assessment with progress measuring Spring of previous year with Spring of compensation year.	
200	Common Assessments of Manila Essential Standards Students assessed at the completion of instruction and following interventions. School goal is that 95% of the students will master the Essential Standards.	Team Points	Through out the school year.	
Instructional Quality = 40% (800 points)				
260	Alpine Collaboration Incentive Plan Based on an Alpine District Rubric used for a district incentive based pay plan.	Team Points	January or February	Teacher, Administrator and Parents
200	Manila Observation Checklist	Individual Points	Ten observations spread through out the year	Administrator and Teachers
340	Quality Teaching Goals Rubric	Individual Points	Reviewed in Spring with administrator	Administrator and Teachers
Parent Satisfaction = 20% (400 points)				
200	Parent Satisfaction Survey	Individual Points	Spring – Electronically Administered	Offered to All Parents
200	Survey by Parents at a Collaboration Presentation	Team Points	January or February	Offered to All Parents
Total Points Possible = 2000 Team Points Possible = 960 (Each team member receives the same number of points for the Team measures) Individual Points Possible = 1040		Total points earned for the entire school will be divided into the total possible to determine actual point value. Teacher compensation (TC) will be the teachers total points (TP) multiplied by the actual point value (PV). TC = TP x PV		

Midway Elementary - Overview

The plan was required to be built upon 3 major factors: Teacher Quality, Student Achievement, and Parent Satisfaction. Although we addressed each section individually, we aligned each section with the philosophy that professional learning communities have a powerful effect on student and teacher success.

The Teacher Quality portion centers around our 4 Essential Questions, and how we will show evidence that they are being addressed.

What do we want students to know?

How will we know if they know it?

What will we do when they do not know it?

What will do when they already know it?

Teachers can receive up to \$500 for providing evidence of continually asking and answering these four essential questions. In addition a maximum of \$300 per year for serving effectively as a mentor teacher on level I, II, or III.

The Student Achievement portion requires evidence of significant student growth each year, but is still centered around the concept of teamwork and collaboration. The first \$400 portion of Student Achievement merit pay is tied to AYP. If the school makes their AYP target, the entire staff gets \$400. If the school does not reach the AYP target, then no member of the staff receives the \$400, and the school therefore forfeits access to this portion of the grant funds. This reinforces to everyone that we are all, as a team, responsible for the success of all students in our school. The remaining \$400 in the Student Achievement portion is tied to each grade-level team's average student growth score in math. Student achievement will be measured three times per year using a district-created math benchmark assessment. The entire grade-level will receive the \$400 if their students achieved the target average growth-score, and no teacher in that grade-level will receive it if the students do not achieve the target average growth-score.

The Parent Satisfaction portion has three elements with varying amounts of money attached to each. An annual parent survey for each teacher will be completed, with a minimum average satisfaction score awarding \$200. A contact-log kept by teachers that requires evidence of a minimum of 5 positive parent contacts per week to improve communication will award \$100. The final portion, which is teacher-parent involvement in PTA programs and events, will award \$100 based on a whole-school effort to achieve a set level of both parent and teacher involvement.



Wasatch Peak Academy

The Wasatch Peak Academy Performance-based Compensation Plan for the 2010-11 school year was finalized in March of 2010 after eight months of collaboration between the WPA staff, Board, and school community. The program follows the 40/40/20 funding criteria set by the pilot guidelines with compensation targeting Quality Instruction, Student Performance and Community Satisfaction. Following is a brief overview of how the plan will be administered.

Quality Instruction

Three tools will be used to assess teacher instruction. Through principal observations a *Checklist of Essential Components of Literacy Instruction* will be employed to award points to teachers for competency in each of the essential reading components. Fifty percent of the Quality Instruction funds will be awarded through this Literacy Evaluation. Teachers will complete *A Self Reflection according to the Utah Professional Teaching Standards*, worth twenty percent of the Quality Instruction funding, earning points for performance defined in the five Utah Teacher Standards and the Spanish and Service Learning Standards written to assess our specific charter goals. The third evaluation tool is a *Bonus Rubric* completed by the Principal for each teacher worth thirty percent of the Quality Instruction funding. The rubric also aligns with The Utah Teacher Standards, but will focus on yearly goals set by the principal and staff to evaluate progress on those standards with a year-long look at instruction that has supported specific components of the standards. A total number of points earned from these three evaluation tools will be assessed a dollar amount and *each teacher will earn a differentiated award in Quality Instruction*. Any excess funds in this area will be awarded to teachers who may have earned up to five additional outstanding performance points on the Literacy Evaluation. Special Education teachers are part of grade level teams and participate fully in this plan.

Student Performance

Proficiency goals determined by school, grade level and individual teachers will be set for the 2010-11 school year. Sixty percent of the Student Performance funds will be awarded for student progress using whole school or grade level student scores on the Utah Language Arts CRT tests or DIBELS (assessment for grades without available CRT data). There will be a school wide reading competency goal determined by the staff, awarding every teacher twenty percent of the student performance points for reaching that goal. Grade level reading proficiency goals will also be set by teams of grade level teachers and points awarded for their students' performance on the State CRT or DIBELS assessments. Forty percent of the student performance dollars will be distributed to grade levels meeting their goals. WPA is vested in individual student progress, thus we have developed a third criteria to review individual student performance, not always evident on state testing. Teachers will develop individual student plans by completing two case studies on individual students in their class. They will set three goals for each student and receive forty percent of student performance funds if students reach two of the three goals set by the teacher.

Community Satisfaction

100% of the Community Satisfaction funds will be awarded to teachers from points earned on *The WPA Spring Parent Survey*. The scoring on the teacher section of the survey rates individual teachers in twelve areas ranging in responses from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". An average score per teacher is calculated by the survey program and teachers will be awarded a dollar amount ranging from zero to four hundred dollars for their score. Any reserve funds in this area will be divided equally between the three teachers with the highest score.

